REMARKS

Claims 29-48 stand rejected in the Office Action dated November 6, 2007 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Excel (Microsoft® Excel 2000, Copyright (c) 1985-1999 Microsoft Corp.), ("Excel"). Independent claims 29 and 38 have been amended, as well as dependent claims 33, 34, 36, 37 and 39-48. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, following the present response, claims 29-48 will be pending in this application.

A new title is provided as required by the Office Action.

Claims 29-48

Claim 29, as amended, is directed to a grid canvas comprising a canvas, a gridline on the canvas, and a *user-defined* element that *spans multiple cells on the canvas*. The gridline has a property that defines a relationship between the gridline to the user-defined element. If a property of one of the plurality of components on the canvas is *changed*, the gridline property (*i.e.*, the relationship of the gridline of the user-interface element) is maintained. Applicants submit that amended independent claim 29 is allowable over Excel, and the amendment further overcomes the rejection.

In particular, Excel's cell includes an area on the canvas where elements, such as "2+2" (Office Action, Fig. 1, 10), may be placed. However, "2+2" is not a user-interface element and does not span multiple cells, as recited in claim 29. Fig. 3 of the Office Action shows an example image placed on an Excel spreadsheet that spans multiple cells. However, like the "2+2" element, this image is not a user-interface element. Applicants, on the other hand, have recognized the advantage of resizing components on a grid canvas from the perspective of maintaining the relationship between a user-interface element and a gridline. Thus, Applicants submit that Excel does not teach "a user-interface element that spans multiple cells on the canvas," as claimed.

Because Excel does not teach the features of claim 29, Applicants submit that claim 29 patentably defines over the cited reference. Claims 30-37 that depend from claim 29 are likewise allowable. Independent claim 38, which recites a method for creating a grid canvas with features of the grid canvas recited in claim 29, has been amended similar to claim 29.

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons regarding claim 29, Applicant submits that claim 38 and claims 39-48 are likewise allowable.

Claims 38-48

Claim 38, amended similarly to claim 29, is further amended to recite a method for creating a grid canvas comprising defining a virtual gridline, identifying a user-interface element on the grid canvas, and identifying a relationship of the virtual gridline to the user-interface element. The user-interface element may be placed on the canvas either before or after the virtual gridline is defined on the canvas. If a property of the canvas or a component on the canvas (*e.g.,* a gridline property) is changed, the relationship of the virtual gridline to the user-interface element on the canvas is maintained. Further, the relationship is bi-directional such that resizing the user-defined element will move the gridline and moving the gridline will resize the user-defined element.

The Office Action asserts that Excel's cell D10 in FIG. 2 teaches the recited "an element at least in part in a cell" and that the movement of the cell (Office Action, Fig. 1: 12) and the gridline (Office Action, Fig. 1: 14) innately teaches a property of the gridline, and the mere presence of the element geometrically next to the gridline anticipates that a relationship is maintained (Office Action, page 8). However, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 29 is allowable over Excel, and the amendment further overcomes the rejection.

In particular, Applicants submit that Excel does not teach:

"identifying a user-interface element that spans multiple cells on the canvas, wherein the user-interface element is one of the plurality of components on the canvas and may be placed on the canvas at least one of: before the virtual gridline is defined or after the virtual gridline is defined."

Excel's cell includes an area on the canvas where elements, such as "2+2" (Office Action, Fig. 1, 10), may be placed. However, "2+2" is not a user-interface element and does not span multiple cells, as recited in claim 38. Fig. 3 of the Office Action shows an example image placed on an Excel spreadsheet that spans multiple cells. However, like the "2+2" element, this image is not a user-interface element. Further, there is no indication that the "2+2" or the image in Fig. 3 of the Office Action may be placed on the canvas before a virtual

gridline is defined or after a virtual gridline is defined on the canvas. Rather, the gridlines in Excel are defined from initiation of a worksheet, and even if they are set to be hidden, they are still defined on the canvas before the placement of any elements.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Excel does not teach, with regards to the image or to the "2+2" element:

> "maintaining the relationship of the virtual gridline to the user-interface element on the canvas, wherein the relationship is bidirectional, and resizing the user-interface element will move the gridline, and moving the gridline will resize the user-interface element."

The Office Action asserts that the mere presence of an element geometrically next to a gridline is sufficient to anticipate that a relationship is maintained (Office Action, page 8). However, any relationship in Excel between the element and the gridline is not bi-directional, as claimed. In the instance of Excel's image in Fig. 3, Excel does not function to result in both a resizing of the image upon movement of a gridline and the movement of a gridline upon resizing of the image. Also, Excel's "2+2" element remains the same size upon any movement of the gridline, demonstrating that the relationship of the element to the gridline is not bi-directional.

Because Excel does not teach all of the elements of claim 38, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Excel. As claims 39-48 depend from claim 38, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also not anticipated by Excel for the reasons explained above, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 38-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the canceled claims obviate the rejections and the added claims are allowable. Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Lori Anne D. Swanson (215.564.8997) to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Regards,

Date: July 30, 2008

/Lori Anne D. Swanson/
Lori Anne D. Swanson
Registration No. 59,048

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439